A TEXTUAL PROBLEM AND ITS FORM-CRITICAL SOLUTION:
JEREMIAH 10:1-16

Jonathan Ben-Dov

The short pericope Jer 10:1-16 has aroused a large amount of scholarly discussion, in a debate that began with Duhm’s epoch-making commentary on Jeremiah and has not ceased until today. It has long been recognized that the pericope contains two theological foci: the first is a harsh polemic against the idols, and the other is a
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hymnic praise of YHWH, creator of heaven and earth. Those two themes are woven together in 16 verses, in what seemed to some scholars to be an editorial artwork, while others regarded it as compositional artistry.

Even before Duhm, doubts had been expressed concerning the ascription of the chapter to the prophet Jeremiah. It is often claimed that the particular type of anti-idol polemics in this chapter, which is highly satirical and scorns the idols as impotent, can be understood only on the background of similar prophecies in Second Isaiah (chs. 40–48). Jeremiah 10 is therefore taken to be an exilic passage, influenced by the great prophet of the Babylonian captivity, that was inserted into the Book of Jeremiah by its contemporary exilic (or even post-exilic) redactor.

But that does not conclude the difficulties of the chapter. A serious textual problem arises from the LXX version, in which verses 6–8 and 10 are not represented, in addition to other small-scale textual variants that abound in the LXX of Jeremiah. This version has recently been shown to be based on a Hebrew Vorlage, with the publication of the final edition of 4QJer Priest, which agrees almost completely with the shorter LXX version. On the other hand, another scroll (4QJer Priest) accords with the longer MT version. Both Qumranic versions have been more or less known since the publication in 1958 of F. M. Cross’s The Ancient Library of Qumran, and indeed, those most valuable data have come under discussion in research since then.

However, it has not yet been fully grasped that the rich variety of textual witnesses to Jer 10:1–16 forms a unique case, in which a window is opened on the very process of the making of biblical writings. Most commentators conceived of the textual data as secondary factors in determining the formation of Jer 10:1–16, while giving primary status to classical literary-historical considerations. Most, but not all. William McKane has shown, both in his 1986 commentary on Jeremiah (part 1) and in a separate study, that textual evidence forms the ultimate key for interpreting this problematic pericope. It is the aim of the present study to advance this insight.

The missing verses in the LXX of Jeremiah 10 share a common affinity: none of them are part of the anti-idol polemic (including the problematic v. 8, on which see

---

below), while on the other hand they all belong in form and content to the hynmal theme of the chapter. This form-critical analysis adds highly relevant information for the study of the chapter, which could not be supplied by conventional literary-historical criticism. In fact, the classification of hynmic verses in the pericope provides the key for solving the compositional and textual problems. Therefore, in this case form criticism goes hand in hand with textual criticism, on the way to explaining the elaborate literary formation of 10:1-16.

I

The resemblance, both in diction and in ideas, between Jer 10:1-16 and certain passages in Second Isaiah (chs. 40-48), is the most common motivation among scholars to posit the lateness of the former. This resemblance is usually stated generally, without distinguishing the anti-idol verses from the hynmic ones. Davidson has distinguished between the two themes in regard to the contact with Second Isaiah, presenting an extremely valuable insight for the description of the chapter's history. Our first aim is therefore to examine this distinction in light of Second Isaiah's prophecies and to assert its validity in Jer 10:1-16. We shall begin with the anti-idol verses.

The relevant passages in this context are Isa 40:19-20; 41:6-7; 21-29; 42:17; 44:9-20; 46:1-7, which display clear ideational contact with Jer 10. The idols are made of inanimate material, their beauty and splendor brought forth by human artisans in their workshops. As inanimate objects they lack the ability to move or talk, hence they definitely cannot effect whatever happens in the world. This special kind of anti-idol polemics is found, in addition to Second Isaiah and Jeremiah, in several psalms (115, 135) and prophetic sayings. Its main thrust is the scorn of man-made idols, which is why it abounds with petty details of craftsmanship from the ateliers of the carpenter and goldsmith, otherwise neglected professions in the Bible. Indeed, the workshop vocabulary is dominant both in Second Isaiah and Jer 10:1-16, and is common to both with words such as: סמל, זום, זרעים, עץ, זרעים, חוטם, חותם, חותם, חותם, חותם, חותם, חותם, חותם. מщуט, מERCHANT, מERCHANT, מERCHANT, חותם, חותם, חותם. The pronounced recurrence of technical phraseology in these prophecies creates a parody effect regarding the idols and

1 מERCHANT may also be joined to the list. Isa 40:20 speaks of מERCHANT חותם; cf. Jer 10:9 חותם. However, the latter idiom is missing from LXX.
their makers. This parody stems from the conception that the manufacture of divine objects by a limited human artisan is a disgrace to the deity.⁴

Common phraseology in Jer 10:1-16 and Second Isaiah is not sufficient evidence for dependence, since it is only natural that the only two places in the Bible that deal with workshops will use the same terms. However, the similarity exists also in the pregnant term לְשׁוֹן (Isa 44:20; Jer 10:14), as well as in other words that do not relate to the reality of workshops but to judgements concerning the meaning of idols. Thus, e.g., the root אָשֶׁר (Isa 45:20; 46:7; Jer 10:5) expresses in both prophetic books the point that the idols need to be carried in order to move; or the word-pair אָשֶׁר - הָוָה (Isa 41:23; Jer 10:5).⁵ The linguistic correspondence together with the above mentioned common ideology imply dependence between the sources: both describe an artisan-made wooden icon, coated with gold and silver; both mention the bolts that reinforce the statue so that it does not move; both lead to the (differently worded) conclusion that the idols are הביא ‘vanity’; and both state that the idol’s makers shall be ashamed, יהבש.

Nevertheless, as Margaliot has pointed out, it was not the same author who composed both pieces. This fact is discernible from a series of significant differences. First, the word לְשׁוֹן, which is extremely meaningful in Jeremiah, especially in chapter 10 (vv. 3, 8, 15),⁶ is not used in Second Isaiah’s polemic, and similarly the phrase החודה לְשׁוֹן (v. 15), which is characteristic of Jeremiah’s diction (8:12; 46:21; 50:27). In the same way, the idea expressed in v. 5, אל יַבְרֵך, was worded by Second Isaiah as המים или לְזִית (cf. Isa 41:22).⁷ Second Isaiah scorns the idols for their inability to predict future events, unlike YHWH (41:25–29), an idea that is not even hinted in Jeremiah. We should therefore conclude that even if 10:1–

---

⁴ Recently, attention has been drawn to the Mesopotamian roots of this conception. See S. Cohen and V. A. Hurowitz, “أخبار חומת נבטים (Jer 10:3) in Light of Akkadian parsu and zaqiqu Referring to Cult Statues,” JQR 89 (1999) 277–290; M. B. Dick (ed.), Born in Heaven Made on Earth (Winona Lake, Ind., 1999).

⁵ Cf. Also ישן (Isa 44:13, Jer 10:3).


16 is a late passage, it was intended to be included in Jeremiah by someone responsible for this book’s growth, possibly a member of ‘the Jeremiah Tradition’.  

The question of precedence between the two prophets is still open: whenever there is dependence between two sources, is there a way to know which one preceded the other? U. Cassuto was the first to raise the opinion, later accepted by Ackroyd and Holladay, that Jeremiah used this special kind of polemics prior to Second Isaiah, who indeed was his successor in many other issues. However, none of the typical modes of citation and allusion discussed by Sommer is valid in the case of Jer 10:1–16 and Second Isaiah’s idol polemics. In this case of dependence it is impossible to detect in any of the prophets either a direct citation or a literary expansion of the other. Since Sommer’s categories are not valid here, we propose to show that Isa 40–48 antedates Jer 10:1–16.

Resolution should be sought by means of studying the nature of anti-idol polemics in the Bible. In his study of the issue H. D. Preuss states: “So steht Jeremia mit diesem verspottenden... und damit entmachtenden Argument in einer langen Kette von Zeugen, die schon vor ihm so gedacht und geredet hatten”. But the satirical kind of anti-idol polemics is not common in the Bible; it is only found in Jer 10, in Second Isaiah, in a few psalms and a few other scattered verses. Indeed,

---


10 B. D. Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66 (Stanford, 1998). On pp. 32–72, Sommer deals with the allusions from Jeremiah, but he does not directly discuss 10:1–16.

11 As the writer himself concedes, p. 237 n. 112.

there are some prophecies that condemn the idols for being מִכְלָשׁ הָיָד, “work of hands”; Hos 13:2; Isa 2:6–22; Mic 5:12 and especially Hab 2:18–19. But the highly satirical character of anti-idol polemics is unique to the above mentioned chapters from Jeremiah, Isaiah and Psalms, and is grounded upon an acquaintance with Mesopotamian cult practices (see below). Anti-idol satire forms a turning point in Israelite religion that was brought about by the Babylonian exile and became dominant in the literature following it. The genre continues in post-biblical literature: the story of Bel et Drago, the Epistle of Jeremiah and Sap. Sol. 13–14. In addition, as will be shown, it is not congruent with the polemics that Jeremiah himself uses against idols. The existence of such polemics in the Apocrypha is a direct sequel of the satirical idea that became dominant in post-exilic biblical writings, and it demonstrates that the polemical portion of Jer 10:1–16 is a late composition, written after the inspiration of Second Isaiah. This inspiration is not evident from the diction of 10:1–16, which does not closely resemble Second Isaiah, but from its ideology, where it is clearly discerned.

It is now time to move to the hymnal verses, and inquire whether they depend on Second Isaiah as much as the polemics. Indeed, they are often considered equally dependent, but scrutiny will prove this judgement to be incorrect. An analogy is often drawn to the incomparability verses of Second Isaiah: 40:18, 25; 44:6, 8b; 45:5–6, 18b, 21, 22; 46:5. But there is a substantial difference. While the vast majority of hymnic verses in Second Isaiah are in the first person of YHWH himself, Jer 10:6–7, 10, 12–13 are sung by a human psalmist, and turn to the Lord in second or third person. The similarity lies only in the general concept of incomparability, but in contrast to the anti-idol polemics, the theme of incomparability is quite common in the Bible, and its existence in two passages is hardly sufficient for establishing dependence between them. In Second Isaiah incomparability is a component of a large-scale ideological matrix, in which it

13 Since Duhm’s commentary, many scholars view these verses as a late insertion. Preuss, Verspottung, 237–241, detects in it a strong influence of Second Isaiah, and even of Jer 10:1–16 in its final form (!). But the strongest claim for its lateness is the presence of יִנָּהֵשׁ וְסוּכָּה “gold and silver,” that were not widespread materials in Canaanite idols, usually made of עץ וַצָּלַח, “wood and stone.” See below.

functions only by interacting with other components. For example, the uniqueness of YHWH is evident from His ability to predict the future (43:11-12; 45:21), a topic completely lacking in Jer 10.

The incomparability in Second Isaiah is formulated in the fashion of this particular prophet, which appears nowhere else, not even in Jer 10:1-16. Davidson was thus correct when pointing out that the hymnal verses of this passage find parallels in Psalms rather than in Second Isaiah, such as the epithets "לדויד (Ps. 86:10, 95:3 passim) and לֶלֶךְ הָיָה (cf. Ps 47:9). But his conclusion, that there is no Second Isaiahic influence in the passage whatsoever should not be accepted, since this influence is clear in the anti-idol polemics.

Davidson’s claim for distinction between polemics and hymn, that the two separate genres did not belong together initially, is decisive. Even Holladay who seeks to unify the chapter under Jeremiah’s thought admits this distinction (though in different terms): “The diction of the verses specifically concerned for idols... finds more parallel with demonstrably Jeremiahic language than does the diction of the verses concerned with Yahweh’” (p. 329). We shall later claim that at least some of the hymnic verses are connected to the recurrent doxologies in prophetic literature.

Unlike in Jeremiah, where this distinction can be raised and established, in Second Isaiah the two themes are perfectly woven together, with no reason to argue for an initial breach. This is evident inter alia at the very beginning of Second Isaiah, 40:18-25. The solemn proclamations of incomparability in vv. 18 and 25 are not meant to deny YHWH a visible image, as sometimes proposed; rather they state that He has no הָיוֹת, here in the meaning of ‘counterpart’, i.e., there is no god that can contest Him. In the same way, the two idol fabrication verses 19-20 are not later additions, as McKenzie and Elliger claim, but an immediate complement

---

16 Davidson, “Jeremiah X,” 47; Preuss, Verspottung, 168; Weiser, 87-88.
18 Thus first S. D. Lazzatto, Commentary to the Book of Isaiah (Tel Aviv 1970 [Hebrew]; first published in Padova 1855-1867) 305; J. L. McKenzie, Second Isaiah (AB; Garden City, N.Y., 1968) 20; K. Elliger, Deuteroyjesaja (BKAT; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1978) 73.
of the *Theologumena* in v. 18: YHWH has no rival, while the Mesopotamian deities should bear contempt for their ignoble method of manufacture. Hence there is no reason to believe that Isa 40:18-25, which serves here only as an example, is a composite of two separate types. In Second Isaiah there is also no textual evidence to support such a hypothesis. However, in Jer 10:1-16 the thematic connection seems looser, and textual criticism further weakens it.

II

We shall now explore whether the ideas expressed in Jer 10:1-16 suit the overall tendencies of this prophet. As before, we begin with the idol polemics. The nature of anti-idol polemics in this passage does not resemble that of the polemics in Jeremiah’s authentic prophecies (as much as those can be detected). Overholt and Preuss supply a list of relevant passages that in their opinion connect with 10:1-16: Jer 2:5-13, 27-28; 3:1-5; 5:20-25; 14:22. They deduce that Jeremiah is highly anxious in his struggle against whatever is false or vain, שיש והבל, hence the conspicuous presence of these words and their derivatives in his book. In their opinion, Jer 10:15 correlates with 2:5:15 והבל נשה ומושג עתים. Whether right or wrong, the proposed verses surely have some relevant elements for the discussion of 10:1-16: condemning inanimate materials (2:27), picturing the idols as “no gods” or “can do no good” (2:11, cf. 2:28) or stating that they cannot bring forth the rain (14:22). 5:22 and 14:22 should be further marked, since in their dispute with the idols they mention Creation motifs—the victory over and YHWH’s creation of the entire universe (וּלְכָל אלֵי, 14:22)—in a similar way to 10:12-13, 16.

Still, there are substantial differences between the proposed Jeremianic verses and the polemics of 10:1-16. The difference lies above all in the fact that no other place in Jeremiah lays so much stress on the technique of producing the idols.

19 The word דָבַר הָיָה raises quite a few difficulties in the context of the book of Jeremiah and Deuteronomistic literature. See W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25* (WMANT 41; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1973) 81; Carroll, 124; For a different opinion see Duham, 18; Rudolph, 15; Holladay, 293 (and references); McKane, 30-31. Cf. above, n. 6.

Verses like 2:27 and 3:9 that scorn wood and stone do not even come close to the description of the artisans in Jer 10. It should be noted that chs. 2–3 concern wooden and stone idols, resembling the ritual practices of the Canaanites, who worship שָׁבָץ (wood) and מַלְכָּת (stone).21 These chapters give descriptions of worship on the hills and mountains, where מַלְכָּת and שָׁבָץ are frequent, and of an extensive procreation cult, in accordance with Canaanite practice. In contrast, 10:1–16 does not refer at all to stone as material (as in Isa 40–48), and lays special stress on gold and silver that coat the wooden core of the statue. This description corresponds to Mesopotamian cult practices, where wood and costly metals were used to manufacture human-like statues. The prophet struggles against a different cult, and therefore uses different tactics. In fact, in the first chapters of the Book of Jeremiah the prophet is concerned with foreign divine entities as powers external to that of YHWH, while in chapter 10 he does not oppose the divine entity itself but rather its material representation as a statue, that can hold no power at all.

One more fundamental difference should be pointed out. All the prophecies quoted as relevant have a strong concern with the troubles of climate: who is the potent god capable of bringing the rain? This is clear in ch. 14, throughout which the topic is rain and drought. In this chapter Jeremiah explicates: “Can any of the false gods of the nations give rain? Can the skies give showers?” (v. 22). Chapter 2 concerns water as well (v. 13: “They have forsaken me, the Fount of living waters and hewed them out cisterns ... which cannot even hold water”). in addition to what seems to be the direct sequel in 3:1–5 (v. 3: “when showers were withheld and the late rains did not come”). Even the solemn creation prophecy 5:20–25 relates to rain: “the Lord our God who gives the rain, the early and late rain in season” (v. 24). 14:22, the prayer that concludes the dramatic drought scene of chapter 14, is probably the last link in a long chain of droughts and arid years, in whose course the people were tormented by the afflicting doubt whether YHWH is able to provide rain or perhaps another deity should be worshipped for that cause (cf. Jer 44:17–19). In contrast, 10:1–16 presents a completely different emphasis. Despite the presence of rain and winds in v. 13, chapter 10 does not promote YHWH’s cult as the rain-giver in the case of droughts, but raises the theological question whether the idols have powers at all. V. 13 describes a theophany

21 Weippert, Schöffer, 32 n. 47.
praising YHWH’s orchestration of the heavens, but it does not resemble mundane rain-giving scenes.\textsuperscript{22}

One more passage is offered as an analogy, the hymn of 16:19–21.\textsuperscript{23} Even if this passage is genuinely Jeremianic (which is not beyond doubt), 10:1–16 certainly evinces a different tradition. In 16:19–21 the vanity of idols is expressed in Jeremianic phraseology (شركاء, באים, אומרים, לא נהיה) and woven into a hymn praising YHWH’s grandeur. However, the similarity to 10:1–16 is offset by the differences, which lie mainly in the hymnic character of the passages: while chapter 10 includes quasi-mythical statements of Cosmos and Creation, the hymnic elements of 16:19–21 amount to the conventional stanza יהוה יד יבש ויהי כותב נגאס, יברח, a trace of the genre ‘Individual Lament’, not ‘Hymn’. The forthcoming punishment is different as well; the total annihilation of 10:14–15 is much more far-reaching and universal than its counterpart in 16:21.\textsuperscript{24}

III

In sharp contrast to those who seek the harmonistic view of the passage, and in the exegetical approach adopted by McKane, some of the units in this passage can be considered secondary with various levels of certainty. The addition of these units to the passage produced a shift of focus from the original intention of the author to the message of 10:1–16 in its present state.

Verse 2–3a

This short statement comes to discourage the audience from practicing astrology. 3a is the concluding phrase of the statement: ‘Do not learn to go the way of the nations (2a) ... for the laws of the nations are delusions (3a)’.\textsuperscript{25} The next phrase, 3b,


\textsuperscript{23} Holladay, 326, 480–481; Preuss, \textit{Verspottung}, 165. There are serious doubts concerning the ascription of this passage to Jeremiah. See the survey in Holladay, 480.

\textsuperscript{24} Carroll, 348; McKane, 380–383.

\textsuperscript{25} The Massoretic division of verses views the warning 3a as the beginning of the anti-idol polemic in vv. 3ff. However, such a division makes the polemic begin with two
contains a polemic against idols, which is a new concept in the passage. The transition from 2–3 a to 3 b is thematically difficult. How does the command of v. 2 connect with the rest of the passage, especially with vv. 3–4? V. 2 does not struggle with idol manufacture and worship, as the rest of the passage does. Rather it focuses on a different matter—astrology. Astral cult is not the concern of vv. 3–4 nor is it discussed in the rest of the passage. Most commentators either do not notice the difficulty in the transition from v. 2 to 3 at all or attempt to resolve it unsuccessfully. K. Koch claims that אשורית השמיים refer to the astral representations of the Mesopotamian deities, the same deities that the rest of the chapter condemns. But this interpretation is not compatible with the meaning of אשורית v. 2 does not refer to heavenly bodies and their divine power, but to the ostensibly technical dimension of recording the heavenly movements and deciphering them.

Wambacq noted the difficulty and concluded that v. 2 should be considered separately from the rest of the chapter. According to his view, v. 2 is the Jeremianic core of the prophecy, while vv. 3–16 comprise a long series of glosses and additions. McKane adhered to this view in his recent commentary and in a separate study. Though meriting little attention among students of the Book of Jeremiah, Wambacq’s insight cannot be ignored. It is evident that an essentially anti-astrological trend is present in v. 2 that does not reappear elsewhere in 10:1–16. The Israelites came to know these practices only when dwelling in Babylon where they were prevalent, and therefore could not develop such a harsh polemic against them before then. Indeed, Deut 4:19–20 polemicizes against astral cult, but consecutive clauses (3a+3b), in a highly awkward style. With Wambacq, we view 3a as concluding the statement of v. 2, while the idol polemic does not commence until 3b.


28 Wambacq, “Jérémi, X.” According to Wambacq, even within 2–3a two layers can be discerned, with 3a viewed as a later addition meant to escalate the polemics of v. 2. That may be further evidence for the conglomerate-like character of 10:1–16.

29 McKane, 219; idem, “The History.”
it does not altogether deny its truth-value. Rather, it states that astral cult is forbidden to Israelites because of the direct providence they receive from YHWH, as opposed to the nations. But Jer 10:3a is decisive in its resolution: the heavenly omena are nothing but vanity, and have no truth value whatsoever! This kind of resolution finds parallel in Isa 44:25, “(l, the Lord)... who annuls the omens of diviners31 and makes fools of the augurs; who turns sages back and makes nonsense of their knowledge,” in a passage that similarly attacks the alleged wisdom of Babylonian diviners (cf. Job 12:12-24). A late dating of vv. 2-3a together with its thematical incongruity with the rest of the passage make it probable that it is not the ancient core of the chapter, as Wambacq claims, but rather an external augmentation of the original message.

Verse 9

Even setting aside the textual difficulties raised by the LXX version of this verse, its place in the passage is problematic on the literary level. V. 9 concerns the expensive materials used to fabricate and clothe the idols. These materials are already scorned in vv. 3-4, while the focus has shifted since then to a parody on ritual parades (v. 5), concluding in the solemn proclamation of 5b. It is unlikely that the materials are once again discussed here, after the hymn of vv. 6-7 and v. 8. Furthermore, v. 9 interrupts the sequence between the hymnal vv. 6-8 and 10. LXX places v. 9 following הָאָבֵּר of v. 5, in itself severely deformed in the Greek version. LXX further displays a different version of 9b.32 The scroll 4QJer6 seems to parallel the text of LXX in v. 9 as in the rest of the chapter.

The adduced problems, especially the different placement of v. 9 in the versions, raise serious doubts as to its originality and prompt the conclusion that it is a later


32 See Bogaert, “Les Mécanismes.”
insertion, copied into two different places in MT and LXX respectively. The reason for the insertion is probably associative; the anti-idol verses already present in the passage (3b-5) were augmented by associatively connected statements. However, the elaborate Überlieferungsgeschichte of the chapter does not permit a clear conclusion where, if at all, was the original place of v. 9.

Verse 11

The Aramaic language of this verse makes it an exception both in its immediate Hebrew context and in the entire book of Jeremiah. There is no other example in the entire Bible to this language-switch of one verse only. It differs both from the Aramaic term in Gen 31:47 and from the Aramaic chapters in Daniel and Ezra. Therefore a doubt immediately rises whether v. 11 is organic to its context. This doubt is underscored by the change in literary type between vv. 10-11-12. V. 11 is neither polemical like vv. 3-5, 9 nor hymnic like vv. 6-7, 10, 12-13; it is rather a declaration that can be viewed either as a curse against the idols or as a popular saying of encouragement in Israelite circles. Whatever its true nature is, it is impossible that v. 11 functions here just like any other verse from the prophecy. In a similar way to vv. 2 and 9, verse 11 was added to the original pericope by association to the already present anti-idol polemics.

The presence of vv. 2, 9 and 11 according to the analysis given above supplies further support for viewing 10:1-16 as a collection of initially unconnected verses

---

33 Thus Volz, 123. Commentators raise various proposals concerning the 'original' place of v. 9; for example Rudolph, 60, places it in the middle of v. 4. Cf. J. G. Janzen, Studies in the Text of Jeremiah (HSM 6; Cambridge, Mass., 1973) 233 n. 21.

34 A shift of Gattung is not a sufficient condition for distinguishing compositional layers. See F. Crüsemann, Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel (WMANT 32; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969) 69ff., and opposing him, T. E. McComiskey, "The Hymnic Elements of the Prophecy of Amos: A Study of Form-Critical Methodology," in A Tribute to Gleason Archer (ed. W. C. Kaiser and R. F. Youngblood; Chicago, 1986) 105-128, esp. 105-107; Margaliot, "Jeremiah X," 296 n. 12. However, in the present case form criticism is not the only motive for distinction.

35 Rudolph, 71.

36 Margaliot, "Jeremiah X," 303.
put together by association, in line with McKane's commentary, rather than as an intentionally elaborate rhetorical unit. It seems probable that the original nucleus of the prophecy concerned some kind of anti-idol polemics, with further polemical verses and a hymnic chain added (see below). In the course of our effort to detect the original extent of this nucleus, this is the time to address the peculiar nature of the significant hymnic verses 10:6-7, 8, 10, 12-13.

IV

The primary piece of evidence in the study of the hymnic dimension in 10:1-16 is the absence of vv. 6-7, 8, 10 from the Hebrew text of 4QJer and LXX. The existence of a short Hebrew text prevents the possibility that the shorter version in LXX is an act of the Greek translator.37 The question is now: did the short version come first and was later added to, or was it the long version that came first and later abbreviated by a second scribe? The answer must take into account the textual situation in the versions of Jeremiah. It is common to assume with Tov and Bogaert that the book of Jeremiah circulated in two 'editions': the first is the shorter version of LXX and 4QJer, while the latter is the expanded version of MT and 4QJer.38 Most of the variations between these editions are recurrent cases of the same textual phenomena, for example the tendency of MT to supply fuller names and titles of persons, or to expand the formulaic titles of distinct prophecies as against the simple form of these components in LXX.39 In the same manner, the epithet נבלי is not represented in the LXX for most of its occurrences in MT. These recurring variants appear to be corrections typical of a copyist. Such a person does not have the authority to impose new material on the ancient text or to extract significant portions of it, but does not consider it wrong to fill in 'technical' lacunae

37 As McKane, "The History," emphasizes. See also Tov, DJD XV, 174-175.


39 See Janzen, Studies, 139-154; Tov, "Characterization."
such as a person's patronymic by information he already knows from other places. Deuteronomistic phraseology is not considered intrusive either. It is common to regard these recurrent variations as expansions added in the second edition, which did not exist in the original text. Rofé has claimed that in some cases, as in the case of the epithet מָצָּא, the opposite is correct, i.e., the compiler of the Hebrew Vorlage of LXX omitted this epithet intentionally due to theological motives. Be as it may, the prudent reader should not avoid the careful scrutiny of each and every variant in the book of Jeremiah, to determine whether MT or LXX present the primary reading.

The extra verses of MT 10:6–8, 10 are uncharacteristic of the majority of textual variants in Jeremiah since they do not belong to any recurrent, so to speak, 'technical' pattern of variants such as expanding personal names and titles. Rather, these verses present completely new material, which is neither known from any other precedent in Jeremiah nor do they reduplicate the formulaic deuteronomistic discourse. What then is the textual history of vv. 6–8, 10? It is unlikely that MT came first and was subsequently shortened by a later scribe, since no omission of that scope in this kind of textual material is known in the Bible and its ancient versions. Most of the scholars who prefer the MT version over LXX do not relate to this question. There are those who account for the variants by explaining the LXX version as an exegetical attempt to simplify the awkward order of MT. However, in that case we would have expected a reordering of the chapter, such as that done on a smaller scale in vv. 5, 9, rather than a blunt omission. In contrast, the possibility of an expansion in MT is better accounted for, as explicated below.

---


41 Holladay, 330, assumes that MT and LXX represent two different letters from Jeremiah to the diaspora, in the years 594 and 587 BCE. This is certainly a far-reaching hypothesis. Still, what can be the reason to send after seven years the same letter with four additional verses? Moreover, today we should practice caution about the 'local texts' theory established by F. M. Cross, and used by Holladay in his proposition.
Seeking to integrate the textual data with the categories of literary-historical criticism in Jeremiah (as does E. Tov), we note according to the source theory by Mowinckel, that Jer 10:6–8, 10 belong to the heterogeneous ‘post-deuteronomic’ source D. Equally, according to the (sometimes) rival ‘deuteronomic redaction’ theory propagated by J. P. Hyatt, as in other late passages in the book (such as chs. 50–51), very few deuteronomic traces can be discerned in 10:1–16. It is natural to conclude that the formation of this pericope took place following the deuteronomic redaction of Jeremiah. Furthermore, the entire block Jer 9:22–10:25 bears the character of a miscellanea of varied passages—a wisdom reflection (9:22–23), the conglomerate of 10:1–16, the confession of 10:23–24 and the psalmic conclusion 10:25 (=Ps 79:6–7)—standing at the seam between 9:21 and the new prophecy of 11:1ff. One can therefore speculate that the aggregation process took place while the passage 10:1–16 was on a separate scroll, only later to be joined with the complete book. It is clear that conventional conceptions about the formation of Jeremiah are not valid in 10:1–16, joined with this book only after most of it was already composed. Therefore a distinct mechanism should be sought, one that can explain the peculiar formation of the present passage, with its unusual textual variants.

In the present case textual criticism will benefit from the inferences of form criticism. Until now we came to the following conclusions: 1) Hymnic verses and anti-idol polemics are two distinct components in 10:1–16. 2) The entire passage bears the character of a conglomerate, with various elements associatively connected. In this special case the finds of textual criticism dovetail to a great extent with the two former conclusions: 1) Some of the aggregated material is absent from the LXX version, possibly revealing an intermediary stage of the literary process; and 2) None of the missing verses in LXX are an anti-idol polemic (not even v. 8; see below), while the missing verses 6–7 and 10 are hymnic verses.

\[\text{\small Tov, ‘The Literary History,’ 219–220, presents a matrix of the pluses in Jeremiah MT with the sources proposed by Mowinckel. In n. 31 Tov briefly suggests the affinity of 10:6–8, 10 with the doxologies.} \]

proper. We are therefore permitted to induce from the textual data about the very process of literary composition of our passage. While this kind of induction is not prevalent in biblical research, where textual data are mostly confined to a preliminary level of study clearly distinguished from 'higher criticism', the book of Jeremiah with its extraordinarily significant Greek version and Hebrew Qumran scrolls, is just the place to look for this kind of possibility.44 I propose to look for the key to this pericope's evolution in the unique behavior of hymnic verses.

V

It was not uncommon in biblical manuscripts to add hymnic, so-called 'doxological' verses upon an existing textual unit, as will be demonstrated below. This phenomenon can be defined, and was actually defined by various scholars, both in text-critical and literary-critical terms. Explanations, however, are usually given in either one of the critical spheres but never in both. I find this distinction to be artificial. A correct view of the formation of biblical scriptures must involve a combination of the two: one cannot put a dividing line between the so-called literary level and the level of transmission, since phenomena particular to transmission procedures existed already in the process of composition. The scribe is always dependent upon the specific manuscript he holds in his hands. Scholars tend to ignore the fact that this manuscript is not an amorphous entity, but a real object with textual affinities just like any other manuscript we know from the 'textual' level. The compositional process cannot therefore exist in its own independent sphere, free from the blurry influence of textual matters. We should therefore expect to find textual phenomena when executing a literary-historical or form-critical analysis of a given passage. The somewhat abstract reflections presented in this paragraph will be illustrated in the following section by some examples, first from the point of view of 'pure' textual criticism and later from the 'pure' form-critical perspective.

The habit of adding hymnic chains to a passage is known from the LXX, but it is by no means an idiosyncrasy of the Greek translators, since the addition was usually performed in the Vorlage of the Greek manuscripts. This can be evinced

44 See E. Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible (Minneapolis and Assen, 1992) 313-349; Tov, "Characterization."
from the existence of hymnic-liturgical expansions both within MT and in Hebrew biblical and para-biblical scrolls from Qumran.

An exceptionally good example is the ending of the Song of Hannah in 1 Sam 2:10. Let us inspect MT first. The last two hemistichs of this verse do not fit their context well: while the entire psalm is a wisdom-like reflection on YHWH’s custom to humble the proud and exalt the depressed, concentrated in the private domain, the last two cola convey a supplication for the benefit of the king, an exception from the thematic course and dynamics of the psalm. M. Z. Segal concluded: “this poetic line is a liturgical addition to the psalm.” 45 He was preceded by de Boer, who states that the insertion of the royal petition resembles the insertion of ‘doxological’ statements at the endings of some psalms (e.g. Ps 41:17). 46 But that does not conclude the vicissitudes of such a textually pregnant spot. In LXX to 1 Sam 2:10 there is a considerable insertion following the words מַעֲבֲדֵנוּ הָדָעְשָׁנִים. This insertion begins with the words κύριος ὁ γιός, and continues with a citation of Jer 9:22–24 in a version different from both MT and LXX in Jeremiah. 47 A very similar Hebrew text is partly extant in 4QSam5. What is the origin of this Hebrew version? The addition of Jer 9:22–24 may have been caused by the association with 1 Sam 2:9: “For not by strength shall man prevail”. In contrast, the Hebrew phrase יְהוָה קָדָשׁ seems to be a hymnic epithet additional to the divine


46 P. A. H. de Boer, Research into the Text of 1 Samuel I–XVI (Amsterdam, 1938) 58. De Boer ascribes the insertions to Greek translators, but that is impossible even in the example he himself brings: the doxologies in the psalms are clearly visible in Hebrew in any textual witness.

epithets already present.\textsuperscript{48} We can therefore say that the first ‘liturgical’ insertion of a royal petition, present already in MT, brought about further insertions of a hymnic character, represented in the LXX and 4QS\textsuperscript{49}. The concluding line of a psalm is a likely place for such insertions.\textsuperscript{49}

Can the above insertions be considered textual phenomena? The answer is absolutely affirmative, since they appear in textual witnesses of the Bible. However they are sometimes ascribed not to the intrinsic development of scriptures but to later liturgical devices. For example, Thackeray opines that the insertions in the Song of Hannah were initiated by the use of 1 Sam 2 in the Jewish liturgy of the New Year Festival.\textsuperscript{50} M. H. Goshen-Gottstein uses a similar argument in his discussion of the scroll 11QPs\textsuperscript{51}. Goshen remarks on the odd selection of psalms in this scroll and on their strange order. He additionally points to some cases of hymnic-liturgical expansions of the original psalms, elsewhere unknown, that bear the character of an (associative) agglomeration of exaltation phraseology. Consequently Goshen claims, pace Sanders who published the scroll, that 11QPs\textsuperscript{50} was not meant to be a copy of the canonical Psalter, but rather served as a collection of Psalms for liturgical practice.\textsuperscript{52} A logical inference from this opinion is

\textsuperscript{48} See also LXX of Deut 9:26 and Jos 24:15. I thank Prof. A. Roë for informing me of these parallels. For a parallel to קָדוֹשׁ הַכְּלָל see the hymnic proclamation in 11QPs\textsuperscript{51} XXVI 9. Note the relation between this epithet and the proclamation of v. 2. קָדוֹשׁ הַכְּלָל.

\textsuperscript{49} A similar phenomenon is found in the end of the text of Ps 146 in 11QPs\textsuperscript{51} II 1-5 (cf. the way Kraus connects Ps 146 and 1 Sam 2:1-10: H. J. Kraus, Psalms 60-150 [trans. H.C. Oswald; Minneapolis, 1993] 551). Ps 146:10 is clearly a case of doxology that concludes the psalm although its thematic connection with the rest of it is weak. Surprisingly, just like in the conclusion of the Song of Hannah, hymnic insertions can be found in the Psalms scroll preceding Ps 146:10: first a citation of Ps 33:8 and then an unidentified hymnic utterance: נַחֲוָת לְךָ מַעְבַּד חַכְרָנֵךְ [...].

\textsuperscript{50} H. St. J. Thackeray, “The Song of Hannah and Other Lessons and Psalms for the Jewish New Year’s Day,” JTS OS 16 (1915) 177-204.


that the textual variants emerging from 11QPs* (at least those of a ‘liturgical’ character) do not bear the status of ‘variants’ in textual research.

This view is somewhat over-simplified, since it does not bear in mind the circulation of scrolls in antiquity. Seeking to copy a biblical book, a scribe could not afford to discard a scroll only because it is of the wrong textual affinity. Scribes used many types of scrolls and inserted into their copied texts the idiosyncrasies of these diverse scrolls. If this was indeed the situation, then the distinction between text and liturgy is blurred, and in the same manner the distinction between a literary level and a textual level in the history of transmission, since a ‘liturgical’ text may have existed already during the long compositional process of biblical books.43

Let us examine a second passage in 11QPs*. Col. XXVI preserves a poem entitled “Hymn to the Creator” by Sanders. This poem consists of a newly composed hymn of creation adjoined to a citation of the two hymnic verses Jer 10:12-13. The poem partly depends upon creational scriptures from the Psalms (e.g., Ps 89:15), and partly develops the ideas of Jer 10:12-13 and their like. This instance exemplifies, first of all, the habit of expanding biblical units by chains of newly authored compositions or semi-rewritten hymnic verses. But in the context of Jer 10:1-16 it shows that the hymnic verses 12-13 indeed belonged to a group of verses which were reused as hymnic expansions. It was our purpose to explain the winding formation process of Jer 10:1-16 by tracing the habits of hymnic verses. We now have an example of a similar process in a ‘liturgical’ biblical text. Perhaps this can give us a hint about the function of hymnic verses in Jer 10:1-16, as hymnic-liturgical additions upon the original polemical text.

M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday (ed. M. Brettler and M. Fishbane; JSOTSup 154; Sheffield, 1993) 193-201.

43 In fact, some textually difficult passages of MT may have been copied from ‘problematic’ scrolls. One would suspect this is the case in the so-called Elohistic Psalter (Ps 42-83), exactly long enough to be included in one scroll.

44 For further reasoning in this matter see P. W. Flint, The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms (STDJ XVII; Leiden, 1997) 202-227.
VI

So far we have inspected the problem of hymnic verses from the point of view of textual criticism. Let us now present a different view of the same issue in terms of classical literary and form criticism. The discussion will commence with inspecting the character of 10:12-13 as follows: 1) These verses are concerned with the creation of the world and its maintenance. 2) The participle form plays a central role in them. 3) They are connected with the summary formula הוהי אלהים玉石 at the conclusion of the pericope (v. 16; for a more definite description of this connection see below). The above three characteristics, especially the last one, were the focus of J. L. Crenshaw’s dissertation, later elaborated in several separate studies. Crenshaw concludes his study with the conviction that there is a doxological layer present in quite a few key-points of prophetic literature, which is not part of the original prophecies, but was added in the time of the exile. The main distinctive mark of this layer is its conclusion with the refrain יהוה אלהים玉石. The most basic example of this layer is found in the ‘doxologies’ of Amos 4:13; 5:8 (, 9); 9:5-6. I believe that Jer 10:12-13 can be shown to belong to the same layer. Thus the following section will depart from the local problems of Jer 10:1-16, in order to discuss the overall character of the doxological layer.

The refrain יהוה אלהים玉石 occurs in this form in the following places: Isa 47:4; 48:2; 51:15; 54:5; Jer 10:16; 31:35; 32:18; 46:18; 48:15; 50:34; 51:19; 57; Amos 5:8, 27 (LXX); 9:6 (LXX); twice with the fuller epithet אלהים玉石 in Amos 4:13 and 5:27 (MT); and four times in the short form יהוה אלהים玉石. The contexts are: Jer 33:2; Amos 5:8 (MT); 9:6 (MT). Crenshaw has shown that the contexts of all the above references share the same basic themes: 1) YHWH’s judgement, 2) Creation, 3) idolatry, and 4) false oaths. The fact that all contexts share the same themes is highly significant, since it justifies the methodological principle that the key to the occurrence of the


56 *Hymnic Affirmation*, 141-146; “YHWH Šābāt,” 156, 166.
formula does not lie in each and every occurrence separately, but in the synoptic study of the entire corpus. This is Crenshaw’s first important contribution. The second contribution is his insight that the נַחֲצָה refrain, rather than being a matter of detailed textual examination, of the kind done before Crenshaw, or a subject of theological reflections, is to be considered a form-critical device par excellence, that yields a distinction of a newGattung with its own setting in life.

Among the occurrences of the refrain נַחֲצָה we shall concentrate on the cases in which it is connected with a hymnic stanza: Isa 51:15-16; Jer 10:12-13 (relating to the refrain of 10:16); 31:35; Amos 4:13; 5:8-9; 9:5-6. Commentators generally quote this corpus in regard to the Amos doxologies, but the scriptures from Isaiah and Jeremiah are usually considered only as additional examples of a hymn on creation, not as ‘doxologies’ proper. Some scholars proposed to view the entire corpus of verses as components of one long poem, or a group of poems with an identical background. Indeed, the mutual pertinence of hymnic verses in Amos and Jeremiah is clear, not only because of the similarity in form and content, but also owing to the common textual problems arising from the epithet נַחֲצָה, that exceed the scope of the present study. This pertinence is significant for the


58 Crenshaw, “YHWH 9habî,” 167-174. Crenshaw’s conclusions should not all be outright accepted, and I do have my reservations about them, though the basic contention is accepted in this paper.

59 The ascription of Amos 5:9 to the doxologies is debated. Its interpretation in Crenshaw, Hymnic Affirmation, 58, 74 is accepted in the present study.

60 These verses represent the wider phenomenon of switching from prophetic discourse to psalmic-lyric poetry, as in Isa 12; 26:1-6; 27:2-6; 35:1-10 passim. See H. Gunkel, Einleitung in die Psalmen (Göttingen, 1933) 86, 91; G. B. Gray, The Book of Isaiah (ICC; Edinburgh, 1912) 229; Koch, “Die Rolle.”

61 B. N. Wambacq, L’épitaphe divine JAHVÉ 5FBA’ÔT (Bruge, 1947) and Crüsemann, Studien, 95ff. both ascribe them to an ancient hymn on Creation, as opposed to Crenshaw who sees the doxological corpus as exilic or early post-exilic.

explanation of the Amos doxologies. In recent research there is a tendency to view these verses as a typical component of Amos' authentic prophecy. The fault in this view is the fact that it ignores the occurrence of similar verses in similar contexts throughout prophetic literature, which can shed light on the context of the occurrences in Amos. Even if one succeeds in solving the incongruities of this specific book, one is not exempt from the remaining corpus of evidence.

The doxological verses are comprised of a varying number of short cola praising YHWH's past acts, especially regarding the Creation and maintenance of the world. It should first be stressed that the divine name never appears within the hymnic stanza, but always at the title, such as הָיָה אָשֶׁר יְהֹוָה אָזְמָה סֶפֶן, and at the conclusion יְהֹוָה טְהוֹךְ תִּשָּׁב. This is an evident form-critical trait that unifies the entire corpus. In other words, the hymnic stanza contains a series of divine predicates, with each strophe, opening usually with a participle, forming such a predicate. By applying the formal typology of the genre 'Hymn', proposed by H. Gunkel and accepted with minor variations, to this hymnic corpus, we come to the conclusion that it constitutes a Hauptstück standing on its own, without the conventional opening and conclusion enveloping it. As Gunkel claimed, the formal unity determined by the participial sequence is not interrupted by the several cola that open with a finite verb. A rather similar hymnic-participial sequence occurs in Job, though lacking the refrain יְהֹוָה טְהוֹךְ תִּשָּׁב — 5:9–10; 9:5–10; 12:17–25 (esp. 22); 26:7–13 — displaying the same cosmological theme of the prophetical doxologies. In these stanzas, too, a hymnic Hauptstück is present without its conventional framework in the biblical poetic tradition.


64 Gunkel, Einleitung, 44–45.


66 We can be more precise and say that cola opening with a finite verb are never placed at the beginning of the entire verse; see GKC § 116x. I do not see any reason for distinguishing definite from indefinite participles, as proposed by G. Pfeifer, “Das nachgestellte erlauternde Partizip — eine Stileigentümlichkeit des Amosbuches,” ZAH 6 (1993) 235–238. The hymnic definite participle can also be found in Isa 46:6; Ps 113:5–9 passim.
Returning to Jeremiah 10, one notes that in v. 12 the first two cola open with a participle, while the third has a finite verb in its middle in order to achieve a closing effect:

"עש אראך בקח / ממך צהל חכמה / ויכבדו נפש שמע"  
The formal analysis of v. 13 should be made in analogy to the parallel Ps 135:7:

Jer 10:13:

לכולל את המחן מים שמע  
ירשל נがありましたן ארי / ברקים להמר עשה / וירש אר חמארפוחות  
Ps 135:7:

"מעל נ BSON ממק החארק / ברקים להמר עשה / וירש אר חמארפוחות"  
The first colon fails to conform to the participial pattern, followed in cola 2 and 4 of the parallel Ps 135:7. The switch from participles to finite verb forms in Jer 10:13 can be explained either as a ligature in the Jewish script (ה-ו), or as a stylistic variation. Either way, Jer 10:13 is part and parcel of the hymnic-participial pattern.

What is the place of this participial *Hauptstück* in the history of the hymnic genre? In his thorough study of the genre, F. Crüsemann presents an outline of its development, in which he distinguishes between the ancient hymn-form quoted by Amos and its later use in Second Isaiah and subsequently in Jer 10:1-16, where the participial series is no longer a vivid creative pattern, and later in various contexts of wisdom and royal psalms. But the presence of the refrain ירח נבאתה שמע equally in Amos and Jeremiah puts a doubt on this proposed chronology, and prompts the ascription of both occurrences to one and the same setting.


The presence of the refrain is stressed against the background of its total absence from the book of Psalms, the largest and most systematic compendium of Israelite liturgy, including most examples of the hymnic genre. The refrain is absent even in places where a participial series appears (Ps 66:6 [LXX], 7, 9; 136:4–7; 146:6–10; 147 passim). Moreover, not only the refrain but also the entire literary type—praise to the Lord for creating and maintaining His world, designed in a series of participles—is a rare element in the psalms. The absence of the refrain from the Psalms, together with its periodic appearance in an out-of-context manner in prophetic literature, both underscore the assumption that it is not just one of the genres of ancient Israelite liturgy, but rather a unique layer of that liturgy that probably did not exist for long. Its limited occurrence within prophetic literature is better explained as a single layer of insertion throughout this literature rather than as a lingering process of literary development, as Crüsemann depicts it. If the genre was known from the 8th century BCE, from the time of Amos to the times of Jeremiah, Second Isaiah and Job, why is it wanting in the book of Psalms, the liturgical anthology par excellence? In addition, against those who construe the Amos doxologies as a remnant of an ancient hymn, we may present salient examples of an ancient hymn—Ps 74:12–17; 77:15–20; 89:6–15—that reveal a strong connection with Ugaritic poetry and are secondarily used within later psalms from the time of the Monarchy, but differ entirely from the kind of poetry we find in the doxologies. It must be concluded that what we call the doxological corpus did

70 Gunkel, Einleitung, 44–45. On the rarity of the epithet נַעַרִי in the book of Psalms see Mettinger, The Dethronement of Sabaoth, 13 (and references adduced there).

71 Only Ps 33:5–7; 65:7–8; 104 passim; 135:7; 136:4–7; 146:6 and 147:4, 8, 16–17 can be brought as examples (see R. J. Clifford, Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and in the Bible [CBQMS 26; Washington, D.C., 1994] 151–162). Of these, Psalm 104 was written following Egyptian antecedents, and is not typical of the treatment of the matter in the Psalms. Most other examples do not come close to the crystallization of the genre in the prophetic doxologies. Ps 135:2 (vfer 10:13) and 136:4–7 belong to two of the latest psalms (Gunkel, Einleitung, 67, 93; O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction [trans. P. R. Ackroyd; London, 1965] 448), hence they are also not characteristic of the treatment of the matter in the prophetic period.

not exist in Israel in monarchic times (or even pre-monarchic, as Crüsemann implies) as a literary type. The hymns of that ancient period bore the character of a semi-mythological epic similar to the great Ugaritic cycles, not of crystallized cosmological poetry.

It is true that the poetic structure of the Amos doxologies is smoother and more intricate than that of the similar hymnic stanzas in Second Isaiah and Jeremiah, their closest parallel in prophetic literature. But in respect to form and content they comprise one single genre.\(^\text{75}\) There is no formal justification for assuming a large temporal gap between the composition of Amos 4:13 and Jer 10:12. The above analysis supports Crenshaw’s main idea, that the doxologies in prophetic literature are not an organic part of their respective contexts, but rather later additions brought about by association to a specific number of themes, liable to such an addition. I believe that the similar verses in Job, that may be called ‘inverted doxologies’ because of the absurd image of God they represent,\(^\text{74}\) were also written at the same time as the writing of the prophetic doxologies.\(^\text{75}\)

As stated above, in light of the criteria of textual criticism and those of form criticism, as Crenshaw showed, the hymnic verses Jer 10:12-13 should be suspected as late insertions. Indeed, what seems like two distinct phenomena is in reality nothing but one and the same circumstance: during the redaction process of some prophetic units, hymnic-doxological stanzas were inserted more or less freely. The editors felt free to perform these insertions, since they did not feel that by adding doxologies they harmed the original meaning of the passage. We are allowed to say that the doxologies have an inferior textual status, which enabled their secondary use in prophetic units and their rewriting and expansion in later liturgical texts. LXX of Jer 10:1-16 preserves an early stage of this process, with vv. 12-13 as the only hymnic verses (Jer 10:12-13 originally stood in immediate connection with the מִשְׁרְפַּת formula of 10:16, while the present detachment between

\(^{73}\) The discussion thus far proved only the formal unity of the doxological corpus. This unity can be ascertained from the thematic aspect as well, but that exceeds the concern of the present study.

\(^{74}\) See for example N. Habel, The Book of Job (OTL; London, 1985) 43, 190-191.

\(^{75}\) It is therefore my contention that Amos and Jeremiah were edited at the same time or at least close in time to each other, at a time not far removed from the redaction of Job.
them is a product of the unique formation of the unit 12-16, to be explained below). MT shows a later stage, in which vv. 6-7 (8) and 10 were added.

VII

Now that we have proposed an explanation for the origin of hymnic verses in Jer 10:1-16, it is time for a closer look at each of them separately. However, since it has already been stated that vv. 12-13 are the key to understanding this passage, and since the dependence of these verses on the doxological tradition has been evaluated, a short survey of the rest will suffice.

Verses 6-7, 10

Vv. 6-7 form a thematic unit, whose uniformity is evinced by the inclusio הַיָּדוֹת. This recurring phrase is also the main thrust of the unit, which seeks to establish YHWH’s incomparability by the widespread device of rhetorical questions. Gunkel states that “Mefach folgen auf solche Fragen die in Nr. 21 beschriebenen hymnischen Partizipien”.76 As shown above, it is characteristic of hymnic verses to aggregate with the existing hymnic exemplars of a given unit. The present study proposes that the participial Hauptstuck of vv. 12-13 caused a second series of hymnic verses to be added to the pericope, a series that commences with the rhetorical questions of vv. 6-7, a traditional component of the hymnic main division.

The supplementary hymnal series continues with v. 10. The second strophe of this verse connects perfectly with the doxological material of vv. 12-13 by aiming to praise YHWH’s ability to disturb the natural order He himself is responsible for maintaining (cf. Job 9:5-7). At the same time it displays a clear connection with theophanic (Judg 5:4 = Ps 68:9; Hab 3:12; Ps 18:8) and apocalyptic (Isa 34:2; Joel 2:10-11) verses. While v. 10b does not formally resemble the doxologies, it certainly resembles them in matters of content, hence it was used in order to supplement them. It is joined with v. 10a, which is more similar formally to vv. 6-7. This hymnic strophe consists of a cluster of three divine epithets—

76 Gunkel, Einleitung, 54; Crüsemann, Studien, 94.
Among the triad we can probably describe its middle component as a late epithet, not present in the polemics of Second Isaiah, but prominent in those of the late passages Dan 6:27 and especially the legend of Bel and the Dragon. As a whole, v. 10 is a hymnic verse opening with a short proclamation then followed by a brief speculation on YHWH's might. It is therefore also appropriate to serve as a supplement to vv. 12-13.

**Verse 8**

The exegetical difficulties this verse raises make it hard to ascertain its literary type and objective. We should therefore clarify some of these difficulties first.

The stems הֵלָל and כָּלַל בְּעַר are typical of the wisdom literature, as well as the noun הָבְרוּ. The adjective הָבְרוּ is prominent in Qohelet, though it does not seem to bear the same sense here. We therefore expect v. 8 to present wisdom ideas, but first we need to ascertain exactly what sort of כָּלַל 'vanities' it ridicules. Is it the idols scorned in vv. 3b-5, 9, 14-15? The answer seems to be negative, since as Kimhi notes, v. 8 immediately follows "all the wise of the nations... all their royalty" of v. 7, and is therefore better understood as referring to the latter. Royal courts and the wisdom-circles depending on them are a prevalent topic in wisdom literature (e.g. Prov 16:10-15), which fits the overall meaning of v. 8. The aim of this verse is to ridicule alien wisdom, an aim not otherwise known in Jeremiah. In this book there are some general statements against wisdom, especially in Israel (8:8-9; 9:11, 22) alongside brief mentions of the wise of Tēman (49:7), and Babylon (50:35; 51:57), but never do we find a full intentional polemic as in 10:8. This sapiential polemic

---

77 Note the paraphrastic presence of two of the epithets in Dan 6:27, which may support the lateness of Jer 10:10.


finds parallel in Isa 44:25, and in the similar but much more intensive unit Job 12:12-20 (esp. 17-20).80

Commentators invest significant efforts in the literal explanation of v. 8, especially of its obscure latter half: מַעֲרֶה הַכְּלִילָה עַד הָאָד. Apart from the concluding words עַד הָאָד, the entire verse is well accounted for as a sapiential statement containing typical wisdom phraseology. However, עַד הָאָד can only be construed as an anti-idol polemics as in v. 3. Holladay claims that עַד הָאָד is in the sense of ‘burn’, and therefore refers to the consumption of the wooden idol by fire as in Isa 44:15. But that is far from certain, since it is impossible to connect the next word יִכָּלָה to this meaning. McKane (following Duhm) proposes viewing עַד הָאָד as a separate element, presently put in v. 8 by mistake. Indeed, the connection between the two halves of v. 8 seems quite loose, and the translation offered by Holladay – "the instruction of nothings is wood" – seems rather wooden.81 Similarly, the translation supplied by Cohen and Hurowitz (p. 287): “lessons of foolishness for it [the idol] is only of wood” does not comprise a full and coherent Hebrew sentence. Therefore we should separate the beginning of the verse that concerns the wisdom-polemic “But they are both dull and foolish; their [i.e. the wise] doctrine is but delusion”, from the concluding words “it is wood”, which are no more than a gloss concerned with the idols. This gloss was brought about by an improper understanding of v. 8a, as if it concerns the idols, probably resulting from the misleading stem עָלָה.

In addition to v. 8, wisdom themes are present in other parts of the second layer of 10:1-16, that of the hymnic verses.82 In v. 12 the divine attributes acting at Creation are יְהוָה חָכָם בֵּית, יְהוָה חָכָם בֵּית, whose presence at that event is not common in

---

80 This passage connects with Prov 8:14-16, e.g. יִלָּכֵד הֵ奔驰 (Prov 8:14a) – יִלֶכֶד הֵvertise (Job 12:13-16); it is cited in an abbreviated manner in Ps 107:40. The word יִלֶכֶד חָכָם is present in Job 12:18; see Habel, Job, 214.

81 Holladay understands the entire verse as "highly ironic", with the author using an intricate word-play on the stem עָלָה. This may be accepted post factum, but it is hard to accept it as the author’s original intention.

82 As stressed by Bogaert, “Les mécanismes,” who puts heavy emphasis upon wisdom themes as compositional criteria of the MT edition.
the above-described doxological tradition. Jer 10:12 identifies the intricate order maintained by YHWH’s decree with wisdom, an idea that recurs in Ps 104:24; 136:5 and especially Prov 3:19–20. This idea is crystallized in the well-known creation passage of Prov 8:22–31, which probably depends upon 3:19–20. We are therefore permitted to conclude that the secondary layer of 10:1–16 was written under a certain degree of wisdom influence. In this supplementary layer, as in Isa 44:24–25, creation hymnology is coupled with polemics against alien wisdom (sic! Not against the idols).

VIII

Another prominent feature of the pericope 10:1–16 is the textual stability of the sub-unit vv. 12–16. In contrast to other parts of the pericope, vv. 12–16 do not contain significant text variants. Furthermore, this sub-unit is reproduced almost exactly in Jer 51:15–19. From those facts we deduce that the sub-unit 12–16 was the first to be composed, and then served as a core to the rest of the pericope. Can we outline the formation of this unit?

First we should note the tension that exists between the hymnic v. 16 and vv. 12–13. The former is the only example in the entire pericope of a nationalistic-particularistic ideology, while all the other hymnic verses are of a universalistic nature. In v. 16 there is a clear influence of Deut 32:8, according to which YHWH is supreme among his heavenly entourage, and he is responsible for Israel’s parallel supremacy. In contrast, vv. 12–13 display universalistic creational motifs, and the incomparability statements of

83 The divine attribute in action is indicated in BH by the preposition ב; see Deut 4:37, and in relation to wisdom Prov 8:15–16.

84 It is interesting to compare the triad of Jer 10:12 רֵאֵשֵׁת-תִּבְנָה-תַּהוֹן with that of Prov 3:19–20 תַּהוֹן-תִּבְנָה-רֵאֵשֵׁת. The former seems to echo the triad of Job 26:12–13.

85 This may be the reason for the insertion of v. 2, warning against the heavenly omina, which resembles נְחִיָּה בֵּית הָאָדָם in Isa 44:25 (see above, n. 31).

86 Thus Holladay and Carroll, and recently D. Rudman, “Creation and Fall in Jeremiah X 12–16,” VT 48 (1998) 63–73. However, the tendency among German-speaking scholars is to see 51:15–19 as the original, and 10:1–16 as the copy (Rudolph; Weippert, Schöpfer, 28; Preuss, Verspottung, 169).
vv. 6-7 depict a transcendental YHWH who holds supremacy over mankind in the absence of rival national deities. This tension proves the incongruity of vv. 12-13 in their context, and underscores the previous conclusion that they were placed in the pericope as a secondary, hymnic layer.

The original nucleus must have contained the basic opposition between the idols and YHWH in vv. 14-16. That this is an authentic opposition is proven by the fact that it is the only explicit occurrence of the contrary relation: לא יואר, “Not like these” (v. 16), while the alleged oppositions in the rest of the chapter are never indicated by this kind of statement. V. 16 describes YHWH as different from the idols: even though “it is He who formed all things,” which makes him a universal master, “stillκαθιϊστηκεν ο Ἰσραήλ ἡμᾶς ο θεόν,” in this way a concrete particularistic message was initially given in a condensed form in vv. 14-16. However, already in this preliminary stage of transmission, the mention of judgment—וַיִּשָּׁב הָרֶם—together with the cosmological epithet יַעֲלֵה הָרֶם הַלּוֹלָת attracted the doxological insertion of vv. 12-13 and the refrain יִשָּׁב הָרֶם in the manner described by Crenshaw. Thus, the formation of the unit vv. 12-16 is determined by aggregation of associatively connected material, the very principle that engendered the growth of the entire passage 10:1-16.

In fact, J. P. Hyatt implied such a method of aggregation in his commentary: “It is very probable that an original poem, composed during the time of the Exile, has been added to by editors and glossators.” Our effort throughout has been to reveal the nature of these glossators. It was shown that rather than by a deliberate act of editorial artistry, the intricate structure of 10:1-16 was achieved through a series of associative insertions of both hymnal and polemical materials. V. 11 was joined to vv. 12-16 at an early stage, hence its appearance in all extant versions. The same applies to the polemics in vv. 3b-5, and after them the condemnation of astrology (2-3a) together with v. 9. This stage of development is present in LXX and 4Qler. As the aggregation process did not cease its activity, several hymnic verses (under wisdom influence) were added: 6-8, 10. This advanced stage is reflected only in the expanded text of MT. Thus we can say that Hyatt’s moderate

---

87 This is the correct sense of וַאֲנַו in v. 16.
claim for the existence of "editors and glossators" gives way to McKane's description of a conglomerate.

The situation revealed by the unique testimony of LXX and 4QJer is one of textual fluidity, which enables this kind of associative augmentation as long as it is not considered overly intrusive. These textual witnesses reflect an intermediate stage of literary development, and allow us a rare opportunity for a window onto the ancient compositional process itself.